UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,102	06/25/2003	Lutz Rosenpflanzer	13907-058001/2003E00251 D	3609

32864 7590 12/08/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
HILLERY, NATHAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,102	ROSENPFLANZER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 10/3/06.

2. Claims 1 – 30 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 – 29 have no practical application as claimed because there is no physical transformation and no production of a concrete, useful and tangible result.

a. The claimed invention remains in the abstract and nothing is made available to the user; thus it does not produce a tangible result.

b. The claims appear to be in the preliminary stages and fall short of the disclosed practical utility. In other words, the claims fail to fulfill and/or reflect the specific, substantial, and credible utility sought by the disclosed invention, and thus do not produce a useful result.

Consequently, the claims are nonstatutory. The claims simply recite receiving and mapping data without producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result.

5. Further, to expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to make them statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1 – 14 and 22 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "identifying and representing the correspondence between the customization settings, and hence the customization of data variable, in the first and second systems" (Specification, p 9, lines 3 – 5), does not reasonably provide enablement for "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a first set of machine-readable instructions" as recited in claim 1. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Specifically, claim 1 recites, "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a first set of machine-readable instructions". It is unclear what a set of data processing activities is and how this set is used to identify and/or represent the correspondence. Applicant argues that support can be found in the Specification on p 9 at lines 3 – 5. However, this citation simply discloses, "In mapping, the integration engine can identify and represent the

correspondence between the customization settings, and hence the customization of data variable, in the first and second systems." Consequently, it is unclear how this method step is to be carried out within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

8. Claims 1 – 14 and 22 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, there is no support explicitly or implicitly for the claimed limitations "identifying a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a first set of machine-readable instructions" and "representing the correspondence using the first set of data processing activities performed in accordance with the set of machine-readable instructions". Applicant simply cites the Specification on p 9 at lines 3 – 5 as providing support. However, this citation simply discloses, "In mapping, the integration engine can identify and represent the correspondence between the customization settings, and hence the customization of data variable, in the first and second systems." It does not disclose that the identifying and representing is performed "using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a first set of machine-readable instructions" as recited in claim 1.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1 – 14 and 22 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, claim 1 recites, "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a set of machine-readable instructions". It is unclear what a set of data processing activities is and how this set is used to identify and/or represent the correspondence. Applicant argues that support can be found in the Specification on p 9 at lines 3 – 5. However, this citation simply discloses, "In mapping, the integration engine can identify and represent the correspondence between the customization settings, and hence the customization of data variable, in the first and second systems." Consequently, it is unclear how this method step is to be carried out within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Further, there is no explicit and deliberate definition of "data processing activity" in the specification. Also, there is no intrinsic evidence provided by the disclosure to fairly convey to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art how the claimed method steps, "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance

with a set of machine-readable instructions", should be reasonably interpreted within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

11. Regarding claims 2 – 14 and 22 – 25, the claims are rejected for fully incorporating all the deficiencies of the base claim(s) from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1 – 4, 7, 9 – 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Granade et al. (US 20020103881 A1).

It should be noted that "data structure" has been interpreted as including a file. The basis for this interpretation can be found in the Specification on page 7 at lines 1 & 2, which states that examples of common data structures include files ... and objects.

14. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Granade et al. teach that Integration manager 202 receives requests in an intermediary language such as XML and then invokes a method in a language or format appropriate for the particular application on backend systems 102 (paragraph block 0042), which meets the limitation of **receiving**

information describing a first representation of data variable information in a first data structure in a first data processing system. It should be noted that the mobile application platform (Fig 1.108) is equivalent to the claimed first data processing system, the XML file equivalent to the claimed first data structure, the contents of the XML file equivalent to the first representation of data variable information.

Granade et al. teach that for data communication, mobile presentation server 114 selects one of WML 310, HDML 312, HTML 314, or other data device adaptor 316 to transmit data information to a display associated with mobile device 106 (paragraph block 0046), which meets the limitation of **receiving information describing a second representation of the data variable information in the first data structure in a second data processing system**, since the mobile device will receive one of file formats WML, HDML, HTML, etc. making the mobile device equivalent to the claimed second data processing system, the file format equivalent to the claimed second data structure. The contents of the WML, HDML, or HTML file equivalent to the claimed second representation of the data variable information.

Granade et al. teach that Mobile application server 112 invokes methods on behalf of mobile devices 106 to access backend systems 102. The results from various backend systems 102 are converted to an intermediary language compatible with XML and passed to mobile presentation server 114 for adaptation to the particular mobile device. Mobile presentation server 114 identifies the characteristics of the mobile device including display size and browser type and modifies the information for presentation on the mobile device in the most suitable format. For example, mobile

presentation server 114 can modify the resolution of an image to fit the display of a particular mobile device (paragraph 0029), which meets the limitation of **mapping the first representation of the data variable information to the second representation of the data variable information, the mapping comprising: identifying a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a first set of machine-readable instructions** and **representing the correspondence using the set of data processing activities performed in accordance with the first set of machine-readable instructions**. It should be noted that the XML is equivalent to the claimed first representation, the most suitable format equivalent to the claimed second representation, converting the XML into the most suitable format equivalent to the claimed mapping.

Further, it should be noted that converting from one file format to another necessarily requires mapping that includes identifying a correspondence between elements in each format. Also, in so far as can be understood based on the rejections under 35 USC 112 and relying on the regular and ordinary meaning in the art, the Office has interpreted "the identification of characteristics of the mobile device" to be equivalent to the claimed "a set of **data processing activities**" and "the modifications to the information for presentation on the mobile device" to be equivalent to the claimed "a set of machine-readable instructions".

Granade et al. teach that if the application in backend systems 102 does not offer multiple locales, an alternate implementation of the present invention translates

information generated by the application into the locale selected for use on mobile devices 106. For example, this may include automatically translating the default language in the application into the language associated with the desired locale. This latter implementation may also automatically perform currency translations between a default currency used by the application and the currency in the desired locale (paragraph block 0038), which meets the limitations of **making the correspondence between the first representation and the second representation available for changing the first representation of the data variable information to the second representation of the data variable information**.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Granade et al. teach that if the application in backend systems 102 does not offer multiple locales, an alternate implementation of the present invention translates information generated by the application into the locale selected for use on mobile devices 106. For example, this may include automatically translating the default language in the application into the language associated with the desired locale. This latter implementation may also automatically perform currency translations between a default currency used by the application and the currency in the desired locale (paragraph block 0038), which meets the limitations of **mapping the first representation to the second representation further comprises establishing a second set of machine-readable instructions for changing the first representation of the data variable information in the first data processing system to the second representation of the data variable information in the second data processing**

system and making the correspondence available comprises making the second set of machine readable instructions available.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Granade et al. teach that Locale information provided to the application by localization component 210 specifies how to tailor information for a particular country, region or culture. In many applications a locale variable causes the application to generate information in a preferred language, currency, date/time format and other information peculiar to the geographic or cultural region (paragraph block 0037), which meets the limitation of **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises establishing a criterion for identifying the data variable in a first data structure**, since the information generated by the locale variable represents the content of the XML file, which is equivalent to the claimed first data structure as explained in the rejection of claim 1.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Grenade et al. teach that data dialog manager 218 is responsive to data compatible with XML and receives additional formatting control for displaying XML using style sheets compatible with Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) (paragraph block 0041), which meets the limitation of **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises establishing an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) file that describes how to change the first representation of the data variable information**.

18. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Granade et al. teach that Locale information provided to the application by localization component 210 specifies how to tailor information for a particular country, region or culture. In many applications a locale variable causes the application to generate information in a preferred language, currency, date/time format and other information peculiar to the geographic or cultural region (paragraph block 0037), which meets the limitation of **the machine-readable instructions comprises instructions for identifying the data variable in a data structure**, since the information generated by the locale variable represents the content of the XML file, which is equivalent to the claimed first data structure as explained in the rejection of claim 1.

19. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Granade et al. teach that if the application in backend systems 102 does not offer multiple locales, an alternate implementation of the present invention translates information generated by the application into the locale selected for use on mobile devices 106. For example, this may include automatically translating the default language in the application into the language associated with the desired locale. This latter implementation may also automatically perform currency translations between a default currency used by the application and the currency in the desired locale (paragraph block 0038), which meets the limitations of **changing the first representation of the data variable information in the data variable in the first data processing system to the second representation of the data variable**

information in the second data processing system using the correspondence between the first representation and the second representation.

20. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Granade et al. teach that Locale information provided to the application by localization component 210 specifies how to tailor information for a particular country, region or culture. In many applications a locale variable causes the application to generate information in a preferred language, currency, date/time format and other information peculiar to the geographic or cultural region (paragraph block 0037), which meets the limitation of **receiving a trigger for the mapping, the trigger identifying a data object class that includes the data variable**.

21. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, Granade et al. teach that FIG. 3 is a block diagram of mobile application presentation server 114 used by the system in FIG. 1 to properly present data and voice information to mobile devices 106. Mobile application presentation server 114 includes a universal device library (UDL) 302. Of course, the more accurately one can identify the features and capabilities of a mobile device then the more precisely and efficiently information can be presented. UDL 302 stores this information (paragraph blocks 0043 & 0044), which meets the limitation of **storing results of the mapping in a collection of mapping results**.

22. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Granade et al. teach that Mobile presentation server 114 selects the voice, data or voice and data device adaptors for presenting on mobile devices by analyzing a stream of data transmitted and received by the target mobile device. This locates an entry in UDL 302 that identifies voice and data capabilities of the mobile device. Depending on the voice device adaptor selected, a different voice dialog may be accessed and retrieved from application repository 116 (paragraph block 0045), which meets the limitation of **the information describing the first representation of data variable information comprises instructions for locating the information in the first data processing system**.

23. **Regarding dependent claim 13,** Granade et al. teach that Integration manager 202 receives requests in an intermediary language such as XML and then invokes a method in a language or format appropriate for the particular application on backend systems 102 (paragraph block 0042), which meets the limitation of **the information describing the first representation of data variable information comprises the first representation of data variable information**.

24. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, Granade et al. teach that a developer uses application builder 402 to create application metadata and other information describing the interaction of an application in an intermediary language. Mobile application presentation server 114 in FIG. 3 uses this metadata and other information to create menus, forms, messages and other user-interface elements in a language appropriate

for display on the target mobile device. The metadata provides mobile application presentation server 114 with abstract descriptions of the application operation and assists in generating platform specific code to display these elements on the mobile display (paragraph block 0048), which meets the limitation of **receiving instructions for data interfacing with the first data processing system; and adding the interfacing instructions to results of the mapping**.

25. **Regarding claims 15 – 21**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject as claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 13 and are rejected along the same rationale.

26. **Regarding dependent claims 22 – 29**, Granade et al. teach that if the application in backend systems 102 does not offer multiple locales, an alternate implementation of the present invention translates information generated by the application into the locale selected for use on mobile devices 106. For example, this may include automatically translating the default language in the application into the language associated with the desired locale. This latter implementation may also automatically perform currency translations between a default currency used by the application and the currency in the desired locale (paragraph block 0038), which meets the limitations of **the first representation specifies a language of the information in the data variable; the first representation specifies a unit of the information in the data variable; the first representation specifies a notation of the information in the**

data variable; the first representation specifies a format of the information in the data variable.

27. **Regarding dependent claim 30**, Granade et al. teach that Mobile application server processes data information from an intermediary language into an appropriate language for an application in backend systems. In one implementation, mobile application server receives information compatible with XML and performs transformations that make it compatible with one or more languages and/or protocols including Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) (paragraph block 0066), which meet the limitation of **making the correspondence between the first representation and the second representation available comprises providing the correspondence in a directory of mapping information**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade et al. (US 20020103881 A1) as applied to claims 1, 2, and 7 above, and further in view of W3C (XSLT [as cited by Applicant]).

30. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Granade et al. do not explicitly teach **the instructions for identifying the data variable comprise an Xpath expression for identifying an object of an object class that includes the data variable**.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be well aware that if the data variable to be mapped is part of a larger data structure, it must be identified in that data structure. Also, in the context of XSL transformations (XSLT), the use of Xpath expressions is well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art as a way to achieve such functionality, as is further evidenced by W3C, which teaches that *XSLT makes use of the expression language defined by (XPath) for selecting elements for processing*...(page 4, paragraph 3), which meets the limitation of **the instructions for identifying the data variable comprise an Xpath expression for identifying an object of an object class that includes the data variable**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Granade et al. with that of W3C because such a combination would provide the users of Granade et al. with W3C's detailed recommendation, which specifies XSLT transformations.

31. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade et al. (US 20020103881 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of REEUWIJK (TM [as cited by Applicant]).

32. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Granade et al. do not explicitly teach **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises:**

receiving a framework for instructions; and inserting instructions into the framework.

However, REEUWIJK teach that *Tm code generation is based on templates: source texts for the target programming language interspersed with text-substitution and repetition commands for Tm* (page 900, lines 4-5) and that *Using the templates and the data-structure definitions, code can be generated ...* (page 900, line 12), which meets the limitations of **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises: receiving a framework for instructions; and inserting instructions into the framework**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Granade et al. with that of REEUWIJK because such a combination would provide the users of Granade et al. with a code generator for recursive data structure software.

33. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade et al. (US 20020103881 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of GRAHAM ET AL. (Sigplan Symposium [as cited by Applicant]).

34. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Granade et al. do not explicitly teach **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises selecting a germane instruction for transforming first representation to the second representation from a collection of instructions for transforming the first representation to the second representation**.

However, GRAHAM ET AL. teach ... an approach to code generation in which instructions are selected by a pattern-matching process that chooses instructions from a table ... (page 32, lines 16-19), which meets the limitation of **establishing the second set of machine-readable instructions comprises selecting a germane instruction for transforming first representation to the second representation from a collection of instructions for transforming the first representation to the second representation**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Granade et al. with that of GRAHAM ET AL. because such a combination would provide the users of Granade et al. with table driven code generation.

Response to Arguments

35. Applicant's arguments filed 10/3/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

36. In response to Applicant's arguments that the claimed inventions produce a tangible result (p 9) because claim 1 recites, "making available".

The Office disagrees.

It should be noted that the Office maintains that no tangible result is produced from exemplary claims 1 and 15. Simply adding a limitation that states, "making available" does not remedy the problem. The Office stated that nothing is made available to the user in an attempt to aide applicant to amend the claims to make them statutory by limiting the claims to include a tangible result not to simply state, "making information available".

Furthermore, the amended claims, specifically the limitation of "making available" in exemplary claims 1 and 15 does not limit the alleged result of the claims to being conveyed tangibly in the real world, e.g., to a user via display, storage, or print.

37. In response to Applicant's arguments that there is support for "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a set of machine-readable instructions" because it is self-evident that the integration engine comprises a set of machine-readable instructions and performs a set of data processing activities (p 10).

The Office disagrees.

The Office does not fully grasp Applicant's logic regarding this argument. First, none of the claims recite an integration engine; therefore, whether or not it is indeed "self-evident" without explanation that the integration engine comprises a set of machine-readable instructions and performs a set of data processing activities is moot.

Second, the only support to which Applicant points for alleged support in the specification is the passage that states that the customization of a data variable clearly "tailors the representation of information in data variables to a specific purpose" (Specification, p 7, line 5-24).

Again, the Office does not fully follow Applicant's logic because in summary the passage cited by Applicant states that the customization of data tailors the representation of information in data variables to a specific purpose. For example, the format of data variables in a system may be tailored to meet the requirements of a particular country, a particular industry, a particular company, or a particular department or site in a company to accurately fulfill even specialized or localized needs. Examples of data customization include language customization, unit customization (e.g., metric versus English), format customization (e.g., month/day/year versus day/month/year), and notation customization (e.g., representing an employee's gender as male/female versus M/F versus 0/1).

It is not understood how this passage adequately supports the limitation of "identifying and representing a correspondence between the first representation and the second representation using a set of data processing activities performed in accordance with a set of machine-readable instructions". Similarly, the Office maintains the rejection of the term a set of data processing activities under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for being indefinite.

38. In response to applicant arguments that Granade et al. do not teach **mapping the first representation of the data variable information to the second representation of the data variable information** because Granade et al. changes the information itself (pp 12 & 13, regarding claims 1 and 22 – 25).

The Office disagrees.

First, the limitations of exemplary claim 1 do not preclude the modification of the information itself. Second, by Applicant's own admission, Grande et al. teach modifying the resolution of an image (p 12, last paragraph). The Office does not fully follow how changing the resolution of an image does not change the representation of that image. Last, by applicant's own admission via citation of Granade, Granade et al. clearly teaches that the modifications occur to fit the display of a particular mobile device (p 12, third block paragraph). The whole purpose of Granade et al. is to modify documents to fit the display of mobile devices thus changing the representation of information.

It should be noted that new citations of Granade et al. are used to reject claims 22 – 25. Also, applicant's arguments concerning claims 15 and 26 – 29 (pp 14 & 15) have the same rationale as claims 1 and 22 – 25 and are thus similarly addressed.

39. In response to Applicant's arguments that Granade et al. do not teach **mapping the first representation to the second representation further comprises establishing a second set of machine-readable instructions for changing the first representation of the data variable information in the first data processing system**

to the second representation of the data variable information because Granade does not establish machine-readable instructions (p 13, regarding claim 2).

The Office disagrees.

It should be noted that Granade et al. teach that method steps of the invention can be performed by a programmable processor executing a program of instructions to perform functions of the invention by operating on input data and generating output (paragraph block 0072). The Office interprets a program of instructions as a set of machine-readable instructions, which are established when the programmable processor disclosed by Granade et al executes the program of instructions.

It should be noted that applicant's arguments concerning claim 21 (pp 15 & 16) have the same rationale as claim 2 and are thus similarly addressed.

Conclusion

40. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NH

H. Herndon

Heather R. Herndon
ory Patent Examiner
Center 2100